

# Exhibit B

PARTIES LISTED ON SIGNATURE PAGE

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
OAKLAND DIVISION**

TECHNOLOGY PROPERTIES LIMITED )  
LLC and MCM PORTFOLIO LLC, ) Case Number: C 14-03640-CW  
)  
Plaintiffs, ) **AMENDED PATENT DISCLOSURES**  
) **PURSUANT TO P.R. 3-1 AND 3-2**  
)  
vs. )  
) Hon. Judge Claudia Wilken  
)  
CANON, INC., et al., )  
)  
Defendant(s). )

TECHNOLOGY PROPERTIES LIMITED )  
LLC and MCM PORTFOLIO LLC, ) Case Number: C 14-03643-CW  
)  
Plaintiffs, ) **AMENDED PATENT DISCLOSURES**  
) **PURSUANT TO P.R. 3-1 AND 3-2**  
)  
vs. )  
) Hon. Judge Claudia Wilken  
)  
HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY, )  
)  
Defendant(s). )

TECHNOLOGY PROPERTIES LIMITED )  
LLC and MCM PORTFOLIO LLC, ) Case Number: C 14-03645-CW  
)  
Plaintiffs, ) **AMENDED PATENT DISCLOSURES**  
) **PURSUANT TO P.R. 3-1 AND 3-2**  
)  
vs. )  
) Hon. Judge Claudia Wilken  
)  
NEWEGG INC., et al., )  
)  
Defendant(s). )

TECHNOLOGY PROPERTIES LIMITED )  
LLC and MCM PORTFOLIO LLC, ) Case Number: C 14-03646-CW  
)  
Plaintiffs, ) **AMENDED PATENT DISCLOSURES**



**(b) Separately for each asserted claim, each accused apparatus, product, device, process, method, act, or other instrumentality (“Accused Instrumentality”) of each opposing party of which the party is aware. This identification shall be as specific as possible. Each product, device, and apparatus shall be identified by name or model number, if known. Each method or process shall be identified by name, if known, or by any product, device, or apparatus which, when used, allegedly results in the practice of the claimed method or process;**

Plaintiffs expect that this disclosure may be subject to amendment or supplementation to identify and accuse additional products released, developed, or made available by Defendants after the date on which these contentions are served, or of which Plaintiffs were not aware at the time of these contentions.

Exhibit 28 contains a list of products that are accused to the extent that they are, or have been, capable of reading both SD and MMC cards in the same slot. While the products listed in

1 Exhibit 28 do not appear to be specifically advertised as being capable of reading MMC cards,  
2 Plaintiffs believe that it is likely that these products are capable reading both SD and MMC  
3 cards.<sup>1</sup> See Exhibit 29, Declaration of Dale E. Buscaino. After Plaintiff has an opportunity for  
4 discovery to determine whether the products listed in Exhibit 28 are, or have been, capable of  
5 reading SD and MMC cards, Plaintiffs intend to supplement its list of accused products in  
6 Exhibit 27 as necessary.  
7

8 **(c) A chart identifying specifically where each limitation of each asserted claim**  
9 **is found within each Accused Instrumentality, including for each limitation**  
10 **that such party contends is governed by 35 U.S.C. § 112(6), the identity of the**  
11 **structure(s), act(s), or material(s) in the Accused Instrumentality that**  
12 **performs the claimed function.**

13 Charts identifying where each element or step of the asserted claims is found within, or  
14 performed by, each Accused Instrumentality are attached as 1 through 26 (including Amended  
15 Exhibits 1-6 and 11-18 served herewith) and Exhibits A through SSSS and all other claim charts  
16 and evidence incorporated herein by reference (see below). Plaintiffs have not included charts  
17 for each accused product, as Plaintiffs contend that all accused products infringe the asserted  
18 claims in substantially the same manner. Rather, Plaintiffs have included claim charts, citations  
19 to the same, and citations to infringement analyses of representative products and explanations of  
20 how each accused product infringes. A complete list of each product that Plaintiffs contends  
21 infringes, based on information available to date, is attached as Exhibit 27. A declaration of  
22 Dale E. Buscaino, attached as Exhibit 29, confirms that each accused product listed in Exhibit 27  
23 infringes certain claims of the '424 and '443 patents.  
24

25  
26 <sup>1</sup> Indeed, certain Respondents in the ITC investigations modified their products to not read MMC during the  
27 investigations. Thus, the fact that a product is not advertised to read MMC does not indicate that it has never read  
28 both SD and MMC card types.

1 In addition, Plaintiffs refer Defendants to, and incorporates by reference, Plaintiffs'  
2 technical tutorial submitted to the Court in the Eastern District of Texas for these cases,<sup>2</sup> which  
3 also explains Plaintiffs' contentions as to how Defendants infringe. This tutorial has been  
4 produced to all Defendants.

5 Further, Plaintiff notes ALJ Essex's findings regarding representative products in 337-  
6 TA-841. ALJ Essex found Respondents' arguments against TPL's use of representative products  
7 during the ITC trial as "puzzling," "smack[ing] of petty gamesmanship," and not "genuine"  
8 disputes. (Initial Determination at 82-84). ALJ Essex found that Respondents "do not go so far  
9 as to dispute that the products included in the infringement charts are not, in fact, representative."  
10 *Id.* at 82. "Respondents do not assert that the controller and connector assemblies actually  
11 perform the certain functions differently or have different attributes nor do they present any  
12 evidence to that effect. Respondents also do not assert that the information set forth in the tables  
13 is inaccurate. Rather, Respondents argue that the controllers and connector assemblies are  
14 manufactured differently, have different configurations and specifications, schematics, design  
15 considerations, etc. but do not explain or cite to any evidence as to how these differences would  
16 affect the assumption that the representative products are accurate representations of the accused  
17 products for purposes of infringement analysis. There is no evidence before the ALJ that these  
18 different controllers and connector assemblies are so different as to make the representative  
19 product an inadequate means of showing how these controllers or connector assemblies work. In  
20 sum, it appears to the ALJ that Respondents argue that TPL should not have used representative  
21 products and should have performed an analysis on each and every single accused product, but  
22  
23  
24  
25

26 <sup>2</sup> This tutorial was not submitted to the court in the Sony case, as Sony was not part of the claim construction  
27 proceedings for which the tutorial was submitted.

1 fail to present any evidence that the representative products relied upon by TPL are inaccurate  
2 representations of the Uncharted Products. According to Respondents, TPL should have charted  
3 every accused product in this investigation. Absent some showing by Respondents that the  
4 representative products relied upon are not, in fact, representative of all of the accused products,  
5 the ALJ will not make such an onerous requirement. Infringement analyses of accused products  
6 based on analyses of representative products is not a novel concept before this ALJ and the  
7 Commission and, given the size of Section 337 investigations and the number of accused  
8 products, it is a fairly common practice for complainants to use representative products in  
9 proving infringement. While Respondents are, of course, not *required* to stipulate to  
10 representative products, a failure to do so, especially in cases such as this one where there is no  
11 *genuine* dispute as to whether the representative product is an accurate representation of the  
12 accused products, smacks of petty of gamesmanship. The purpose and focus of a Section 337  
13 investigation as it relates to infringement is to determine whether the accused products infringe  
14 the asserted patent and any means of making such a determination more streamlined and focused  
15 should be the goal of all parties participating in the investigation. Consequently, to the extent that  
16 Respondents argument appears to be that TPL has failed to prove infringement because it failed  
17 to chart each and every accused product, the ALJ finds such a requirement unnecessary given  
18 that there is no evidence before the ALJ that the representative products are inaccurate.” *Id.* at  
19 83-84.

20  
21  
22  
23 Further, Plaintiffs note the Commission reversed ALJ Essex’s determination that TPL  
24 failed to show that the accused products can transfer data to or from SD cards with a four-bit-  
25 bus....” (Comm’n Op. at 19). The Commission found that “neither Respondents nor  
26  
27  
28

1 Respondents' experts or fact witnesses dispute that the accused controllers operate in 4-bit SD  
2 mode when an SD card is inserted and in 1-bit MMC mode when an MMC card is inserted into  
3 the card connector." *Id.* at 19-20.

4 While various Accused Products for each Defendant may employ different controllers or  
5 card connectors, Plaintiffs contend that there are no material differences for purposes of  
6 infringement between (A) the controllers and card connectors shown in these contentions and (B)  
7 all of the controllers and card connectors in the Accused Products listed in Exhibit 27<sup>3</sup> to these  
8 contentions for which the controllers and card connectors are not shown. As stated in Exhibit 1  
9 to Plaintiffs' N.D. Cal. preliminary infringement contentions, various exemplar memory card  
10 connectors and controllers are shown in the claim charts attached as exhibits to Plaintiffs'  
11 preliminary infringement contentions and in the documents (including claim charts, expert  
12 reports, exhibits thereto, and witness statements) cited herein. Plaintiffs have not been able to  
13 discern any material differences between the controllers and memory card connectors (regardless  
14 of the controller/connector combination) in these products for purposes of infringement and  
15 contend that there are no material differences between memory card connectors and controllers  
16 of all Accused Products for purposes of infringement.

17 In response to Canon's and Epson's requests for Plaintiffs to further explain why  
18 representative products are appropriate, Plaintiffs state as follows:

19 1. Exhibit 30 shows various card connectors and controllers in a sampling of  
20 accused Canon products. Exhibit 31 shows various card connectors and controllers in a  
21 sampling of accused Epson products. Plaintiffs discern no material differences for purposes of

22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27 <sup>3</sup> And Exhibit 28 to the extent that the products listed therein are, or have been, capable of reading both SD and  
28 MMC cards in the same slot



1 infringement among these card connectors and among these controllers (regardless of  
2 connector/controller combination). Plaintiffs also discern no material differences for purposes of  
3 infringement among all of the various exemplar memory card connectors and among all of the  
4 various exemplar controllers (regardless of the connector/controller combination) shown in the  
5 claims charts attached as exhibits to Plaintiffs' preliminary infringement contentions and in the  
6 documents (including claim charts, expert reports, exhibits thereto, and witness statements) cited  
7 herein.  
8

9           2.       With respect to each Defendant, Plaintiffs similarly believe that there are no  
10 material differences for purposes of infringement among the Accused Products, including the  
11 reason stated in paragraph 1 above regarding the card connectors and controllers (regardless of  
12 the connector/controller combination).  
13

14           3.       Mr. Buscaino's declaration, attached as Exhibit 29, confirms Plaintiffs'  
15 contentions and Plaintiffs' explanation regarding why representative products are appropriate in  
16 these cases.  
17

18           4.       Inv. 337-TA-841 also confirms Plaintiffs' contentions and explanation regarding  
19 why representative products are appropriate in these cases.  
20

21           5.       The ALJ's ruling on the issue of representative products and infringement in Inv.  
22 337-TA-841 is discussed above. In particular, the ALJ stated that "Respondents . . . do not go so  
23 far as to dispute that the products included in the infringement claims charts are not, in fact,  
24 representative." Initial Determination at 82. The ALJ further stated that "Respondents do not  
25 assert that the controller and connector assemblies actually perform the certain functions  
26 differently or have different attributes nor do they present any evidence to that effect," *id.* at 83,  
27  
28

1 and that Respondent's failure to stipulate to representative products, "especially in cases such as  
2 this one where there is no *genuine* dispute as to whether the representative product is an accurate  
3 representation of the accused products, smacks of petty of gamesmanship," *id.* at 83-84. The  
4 ALJ's ruling on these points was unchanged by the Commission opinion.

5 6. Consistent with Mr. Buscaino's declaration attached as Exhibit 29, Mr. Buscaino  
6 found no material differences in Inv. 337-TA-841 between the controllers and card connectors  
7 for purposes of infringement. And, Plaintiffs' understanding of Respondents' experts' testimony  
8 is that there are no material differences between the Accused Products for purposes of  
9 infringement, including that the various controllers, card connectors, and combinations thereof  
10 have no material differences for purposes of infringement.

11 7. Plaintiffs' infringement contentions have not changed since Inv. 337-TA-841.

12 8. Canon and Seiko have not identified any specific differences between the card  
13 connectors and controllers of the Accused Products—let alone any differences that are material  
14 to infringement. The same is true for all Defendants with respect to any aspect of TPL's  
15 infringement contentions for any Accused Product. No Defendant has presented Plaintiffs with a  
16 single product that is allegedly not represented for purposes of infringement by the products  
17 charted for that Defendant. During meet and confer calls, counsel for Canon and Epson could  
18 not provide such an example. Plaintiffs requested defense counsel to bring any such examples to  
19 Plaintiffs' attention so that any dispute could be worked out or explained. To date, no examples  
20 have been provided. Indeed, Canon and Epson agreed on meet and confers with Plaintiffs that  
21 representative products can be appropriate and that separate claim charts are not necessarily  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

1 required for each accused product under the Local Rules. Such a requirement would defeat the  
2 entire purpose of representative products.

3 However, if any Defendant believe that there are differences for purposes of infringement  
4 between any Accused Product and the products charted and shown in these contentions,  
5 including but not limited to any material difference between (A) the controllers and card  
6 connectors shown in these contentions and (B) any of the controllers and card connectors in the  
7 Accused Products for which the controllers and card connectors are not shown, Plaintiffs request  
8 that the Defendant advise Plaintiffs of (i) the product name that it contends is materially different  
9 and (ii) the claim element that is materially different for purposes of infringement, and Plaintiffs  
10 will provide additional explanation, if possible, as to why there is no material difference.  
11

12  
13 **(d) For each claim which is alleged to have been indirectly infringed, an**  
14 **identification of any direct infringement and a description of the acts of the**  
15 **alleged indirect infringer that contribute to or are inducing that direct**  
16 **infringement. Insofar as alleged direct infringement is based on joint acts of**  
17 **multiple parties, the role of each such party in the direct infringement must**  
18 **be described.**

19 At this time, Plaintiffs are not pursuing allegations in these cases that Defendants  
20 indirectly infringe. At this time, Plaintiffs are not pursuing allegations in these cases that  
21 Defendants' direct infringement is based on joint acts of multiple parties.  
22

23 **(e) Whether each limitation of each asserted claim is alleged to be literally**  
24 **present or present under the doctrine of equivalents in the Accused**  
25 **Instrumentality;**

26 Plaintiffs contend that each element of each asserted claim is literally present in the  
27 Accused Instrumentalities or, in the alternative, present under the doctrine of equivalents. See  
28 Amended Exhibits 2-4 which set for Plaintiffs' additional/alternative contentions for equivalents  
and/or under the doctrine of equivalents for each accused product for the following elements:

1 “type of memory [media] card,” “interconnection means,” “means for identifying . . .,” “means  
2 for determining . . .,” and “integrated within.”

3 **(f) For any patent that claims priority to an earlier application, the priority date**  
4 **to which each asserted claim allegedly is entitled; and**

5 Plaintiff contends that the ‘443, ‘424, and ‘847 patents are entitled to a priority date of at  
6 least the application date of U.S. Patent No. 6,438,638/Application No. 09/610,904 - July 6,  
7 2000.  
8

9 **(g) If a party claiming patent infringement wishes to preserve the right to rely,**  
10 **for any purpose, on the assertion that its own apparatus, product, device,**  
11 **process, method, act, or other instrumentality practices the claimed**  
12 **invention, the party shall identify, separately for each asserted claim, each**  
13 **such apparatus, product, device, process, method, act, or other**  
14 **instrumentality that incorporates or reflects that particular claim.**

15 Plaintiff TPL’s OnSpec brand chips are incorporated into products that practice claimed  
16 inventions in the patents-in-suit, but Plaintiffs have no instrumentality of their own that practices  
17 the claimed inventions.

18 **(h) If a party claiming patent infringement alleges willful infringement, the basis**  
19 **for such allegation.**

20 At this time, Plaintiffs are not pursuing allegations that Defendants’ infringement is  
21 willful.

22 \* \* \* \* \*

23 Plaintiff’s references above to “all other claim charts and evidence incorporated herein by  
24 reference” include the following items:

- 25
  - Inv. 337-TA-841 Initial Expert Report of Dale Buscaino and exhibits, October 19, 2012.

- Inv. 337-TA-841 Supplemental Report of Dale Buscaino and exhibits, October 24, 2012 (re: HP Only).
- Inv. 337-TA-807 Expert Report of Dale Buscaino and exhibits (re: Sony only)
- Inv. 337-TA-841 Deposition of Dale Buscaino
- Inv. 337-TA-841 Trial Testimony of Dale Buscaino, at January 7, 2012, p. 415- January 8, 2012, p. 795

Tr. Ex. No	Conf.	Description	Bates Range	Infringement Cont. Ex. No.
CX-0073	C	Canon Ex. 1 - Infringement Analysis Chart to Dale Buscaino's Initial Expert Report	TPL1043428- TPL1043430	A
CX-0074	C	Canon Ex. 2 -424 Canon PIXMA MG8220 to Dale Buscaino's Initial Expert Report	TPL1043431- TPL1043469	B
CX-0075	C	Canon Ex. 3 -443 Canon PIXMA MG8220 to Dale Buscaino's Initial Expert Report	TPL1043470- TPL1043499	C
CX-0094	C	HiTi Ex. 1 -Infringement Analysis Chart to Dale Buscaino's Initial Expert Report	TPL1043932- TPL1043933	D
CX-0095	C	HiTi Ex. 2 - 424 HiTi P110S to Dale Buscaino's Initial Expert Report	TPL1043934- TPL1043976	E
CX-0096	C	HiTi Ex. 3 -443 HiTi P110S to Dale Buscaino's Initial Expert Report	TPL1043977- TPL1043988	F
CX-0097	C	HP Ex. 1 - Notebook Infringement Analysis Chart to Dale Buscaino's Initial Expert Report	TPL1043989- TPL1043996	G
CX-0098	C	HP Ex. 2- Printer Infringement Analysis Chart to Dale Buscaino's Initial Expert Report	TPL1043997- TPL1043999	H
CX-0099	C	HP Ex. 3 -424 HP 630 to Dale Buscaino's Initial Expert Report	TPL1044000- TPL1044018	I

Tr. Ex. No	Conf.	Description	Bates Range	Infringement Cont. Ex. No.
CX-0100	C	HP Ex. 4 -424 HP 644491-001 Card Reader to Dale Buscaino's Initial Expert Report	TPL1044019- TPL1044040	J
CX-0101	C	HP Ex. 5 -424 HP [REDACTED] Card Reader to Dale Buscaino's Initial Expert Report	TPL1044041- TPL1044080	K
CX-0102	C	HP Ex. 6 -424 HP Photosmart 5510 to Dale Buscaino's Initial Expert Report	TPL1044081- TPL1044116	L
CX-0103	C	HP Ex. 7 - 443 HP 630 to Dale Buscaino's Initial Expert Report	TPL1044117- TPL1044126	M
CX-0104	C	HP Ex. 8- 443 HP 644491-001 Card Reader to Dale Buscaino's Initial Expert Report	TPL1044127- TPL1044143	N
CX-0105	C	HP Ex. 9 - 443 HP [REDACTED] Card Reader to Dale Buscaino's Initial Expert Report	TPL1044144- TPL1044158	O
CX-0106	C	HP Ex. 10 - 443 HP Photosmart 5510 to Dale Buscaino's Initial Expert Report	TPL1044159- TPL1044187	P
CX-0107	C	HP Ex. 11 -549 HP 644491-001 Card Reader to Dale Buscaino's Initial Expert Report	TPL1044188- TPL1044219	Q
CX-0108	C	HP Ex. 12 - 549 HP [REDACTED] Card Reader to Dale Buscaino's Initial Expert Report	TPL1044220- TPL1044248	R
CX-0109	C	HP Ex. 15 - 847 HP [REDACTED] Card Reader to Dale Buscaino's Initial Expert Report	TPL1044249- TPL1044269	S
CX-0110	C	HP Amended Exhibit 4 - 424 HP 644491-001 Card Reader to Dale Buscaino's Initial Expert Report	TPL1044270- TPL1044297	T

Tr. Ex. No	Conf.	Description	Bates Range	Infringement Cont. Ex. No.
CX-0111	C	HP Amended Exhibit 5-424 HP [REDACTED] Card Reader to Dale Buscaino's Initial Expert Report	TPL1044298- TPL1044340	U
CX-0112	C	HP Amended Exhibit 8 -443 HP 644491-001 Card Reader to Dale Buscaino's Initial Expert Report	TPL1044341- TPL1044363	V
CX-0113	C	HP Amended Exhibit 9 - 443 HP [REDACTED] Card Reader to Dale Buscaino's Initial Expert Report	TPL1044364- TPL1044380	W
CX-0114	C	HP Amended Exhibit 11 - 549 HP 644491-001 Card Reader to Dale Buscaino's Initial Expert Report	TPL1044381- TPL1044418	X
CX-0115	C	HP Amended Exhibit 12 - 549 HP [REDACTED] Card Reader to Dale Buscaino's Initial Expert Report	TPL1044419- TPL1044449	Y
CX-0116	C	HP Amended Exhibit 15 - 847 HP [REDACTED] Card Reader to Dale Buscaino's Initial Expert Report	TPL1044450- TPL1044472	Z
CX-0117	C	Kingston Ex. 1 -Infringement Analysis Chart to Dale Buscaino's Initial Expert Report	TPL1044473- TPL1044474	AA
CX-0118		Kingston Ex. 2 - 424 Kingston FCR-HS219-1 to Dale Buscaino's Initial Expert Report	TPL1044475- TPL1044513	BB
CX-0119	C	Kingston Ex. 3 - 443 Kingston FCR-HS219-1 to Dale Buscaino's Initial Expert Report	TPL1044514- TPL1044528	CC
CX-0120	C	Kingston Ex. 4- 623 Kingston FCR-HS219-1 to Dale Buscaino's Initial Expert Report	-TPL1044529- TPL1044542	DD
CX-0121	C	Rosewill Ex. 1 - Infringement Analysis Chart to Dale Buscaino's Initial Expert Report	TPL1044543- TPL1044544	EE

Tr. Ex. No	Conf.	Description	Bates Range	Infringement Cont. Ex. No.
CX-0122	C	Rosewill Ex. 2 -424 Rosewill RCR- YJ-EX601 to Dale Buscaino's Initial Expert Report	TPL1044545- TPL1044561	FF
CX-0123	C	Rosewill Ex. 3 - 443 Rosewill RCR-YJ-EX601 to Dale Buscaino's Initial Expert Report	TPL1044562- TPL1044572	GG
CX-0124	C	Rosewill Ex. 4- 549 Rosewill RCR- YJ-EX601 to Dale Buscaino's Initial Expert Report	TPL1044573- TPL1044598	HH
CX-0125	C	Rosewill Ex. 5 -623 Rosewill RCR- YJ-EX601 to Dale Buscaino's Initial Expert Report	TPL1044599- TPL1044615	II
CX-0126	C	Seiko Ex. 1 -Seiko Epson Infringement Analysis Chart to Dale Buscaino's Initial Expert	TPL1044616- TPL1044619	JJ
CX-0127	C	Seiko Ex. 2 - 424 Seiko Epson Artisan 730 to Dale Buscaino's Initial Expert Report	TPL1044620- TPL1044659	KK
CX-0128	C	Seiko Ex. 3 -443 Seiko Epson Artisan 730 to Dale Buscaino's Initial Expert Report	TPL1044660- TPL1044692	LL
CX-0129	C	Seiko Ex. 4 -549 Seiko Epson Artisan 730 to Dale Buscaino's Initial Expert Report	TPL1044693- TPL1044720	MM
		TPL Complaint Exhibit 41- Claim Chart applying U.S. Patent No. 7,522,424 to Accused Falcon Northwest Computer Systems Product	TPL 1022004- TPL1022020	NN
		TPL Complaint Exhibit 43- Claim Chart applying U.S. Patent No. 7,295,443 to accused Falcon Northwest Computer Systems product	TPL1022030- TPL1022041	OO



Tr. Ex. No	Conf.	Description	Bates Range	Infringement Cont. Ex. No.
		TPL Complaint Exhibit 44- Claim Chart applying U.S. Patent No. 7,162,549 to accused Falcon Northwest Computer Systems product	TPL1022042- TPL1022064	PP
		TPL Complaint Exhibit 45- Claim Chart applying U.S. Patent No. 6,976,623 to accused Falcon Northwest Computer Systems product	TPL1022065- TPL1022090	QQ
		TPL Complaint Exhibit 96- Claim Chart applying U.S. Patent No. 7,522,424 to accused Shuttle, Inc. product	TPL1022868- TPL1022885	RR
		TPL Complaint Exhibit 98- Claim Chart applying U.S. Patent No. 7,295,443 to accused Shuttle, Inc. product	TPL1022892- TPL1022904	SS
CX-0021		TPL Complaint Exhibit 24- Claim Chart applying U.S. Patent No. 7,522,424 to accused Canon, Inc. product	TPL1021646- TPL1021667	TT
CX-0022		TPL Complaint Exhibit 26- Claim Chart applying U.S. Patent No. 7,295,443 to accused Canon, Inc. product	TPL1021674- TPL1021701	UU
CX-0032		TPL Complaint Exhibit 55- Claim Chart applying U.S. Patent No. 7,522,424 to accused Hewlett-Packard Company product	TPL1022235- TPL1022257	VV
CX-0033		TPL Complaint Exhibit 57- Claim Chart applying U.S. Patent No. 7,295,443 to accused Hewlett-Packard Company product	TPL1022276- TPL1022299	WW

Tr. Ex. No	Conf.	Description	Bates Range	Infringement Cont. Ex. No.
CX-0034		TPL Complaint Exhibit 58- Claim Chart applying U.S. Patent No. 7,162,549 to accused Hewlett-Packard Company product	TPL1022300- TPL1022320	XX
CX-0035		TPL Complaint Exhibit 59- Claim Chart applying U.S. Patent No. 7,719,847 to accused Hewlett-Packard product	TPL1022321- TPL1022334	YY
CX-0036		TPL Complaint Exhibit 60- Claim Chart applying U.S. Patent No. 7,522,424 to accused HiTi Digital, Inc. product	TPL1022335- TPL1022356	ZZ
CX-0037		TPL Complaint Exhibit 62- Claim Chart applying U.S. Patent No. 7,295,443 to accused HiTi Digital, Inc., product	TPL1022360- TPL1022370	AAA
CX-0038		TPL Complaint Exhibit 63- Claim Chart applying U.S. Patent No. 7,162,549 to accused HiTi Digital, Inc., product	TPL1022371- TPL1022391	BBB
CX-0039		TPL Complaint Exhibit 64- Claim Chart applying U.S. Patent No. 7,522,424 to accused Kingston Technology Company, Inc. product	TPL1022392- TPL1022409	CCC
CX-0040		TPL Complaint Exhibit 66- Claim Chart applying U.S. Patent No. 7,295,443 to accused Kingston Technology Company, Inc., product	TPL1022420- TPL1022431	DDD
CX-0041		TPL Complaint Exhibit 67- Claim Chart applying U.S. Patent No. 6,976,623 to accused Kingston Technology Company, Inc., product	TPL1022432- TPL1022446	EEE

Tr. Ex. No	Conf.	Description	Bates Range	Infringement Cont. Ex. No.
CX-0042		TPL Complaint Exhibit 77- Claim Chart applying U.S. Patent No. 7,522,424 to accused Rosewill, Inc. product	TPL1022569- TPL1022585	FFF
CX-0043		TPL Complaint Exhibit 80- Claim Chart applying U.S. Patent No. 7,295,443 to accused Rosewill, Inc., product	TPL1022595- TPL1022603	GGG
CX-0044		TPL Complaint Exhibit 81- Claim Chart applying U.S. Patent No. 7,162,549 to accused Rosewill, Inc. product	TPL1022604- TPL1022624	HHH
CX-0045		TPL Complaint Exhibit 82- Claim Chart applying U.S. Patent No. 6,976,623 to accused Rosewill, Inc. product	TPL1022625- TPL1022644	III
CX-0046		TPL Complaint Exhibit 91- Claim Chart applying U.S. Patent No. 7,522,424 to accused Seiko Epson Corporation product	TPL1022763- TPL1022784	JJJ
CX-0047		TPL Complaint Exhibit 93- Claim Chart applying U.S. Patent No. 7,295,443 to accused Seiko Epson Corporation product	TPL1022800- TPL1022819	KKK
CX-0048		TPL Complaint Exhibit 94- Claim Chart applying U.S. Patent No. 7,162,549 to accused Seiko Epson Corporation product	TPL1022820- TPL1022843	LLL
CX-0049		TPL Complaint Exhibit 95 Claim Chart applying U.S. Patent No. 7,162,549 to accused Seiko Epson Corporation product	TPL1022844- TPL1022867	MMM
		TPL Claim Chart applying U.S. Patent No. 7,522,424 to accused Sony product		NNN

Tr. Ex. No	Conf.	Description	Bates Range	Infringement Cont. Ex. No.
		TPL Claim Chart applying U.S. Patent No. 7,295,443 to accused Sony product		OOO
		TPL Claim Chart applying U.S. Patent No. 7,522,424 to accused Sony product		PPP
		TPL Claim Chart applying U.S. Patent No. 7,295,443 to accused Sony product		QQQ
		TPL Claim Chart applying U.S. Patent No. 7,522,424 to accused Sony product		RRR
		TPL Claim Chart applying U.S. Patent No. 7,295,443 to accused Sony product		SSS
		TPL Claim Chart applying U.S. Patent No. 7,522,424 to accused Sony product		TTT
		TPL Claim Chart applying U.S. Patent No. 7,295,443 to accused Sony product		UUU
		TPL Claim Chart applying U.S. Patent No. 7,522,424 to accused Sony product		VVV
		TPL Claim Chart applying U.S. Patent No. 7,295,443 to accused Sony product		WWW
		TPL Claim Chart applying U.S. Patent No. 7,522,424 to accused Sony product		XXX
		TPL Claim Chart applying U.S. Patent No. 7,295,443 to accused Sony product		YYY
		TPL Claim Chart applying U.S. Patent No. 7,522,424 to accused Sony product		ZZZ

Tr. Ex. No	Conf.	Description	Bates Range	Infringement Cont. Ex. No.
		TPL Claim Chart applying U.S. Patent No. 7,295,443 to accused Sony product		AAAA
		TPL Claim Chart applying U.S. Patent No. 7,522,424 to accused Sony product		BBBB
		TPL Claim Chart applying U.S. Patent No. 7,295,443 to accused Sony product		CCCC
		TPL Claim Chart applying U.S. Patent No. 7,522,424 to accused Sony product		DDDD
		TPL Claim Chart applying U.S. Patent No. 7,295,443 to accused Sony product		EEEE
		TPL Claim Chart applying U.S. Patent No. 7,522,424 to accused Sony product		FFFF
		TPL Claim Chart applying U.S. Patent No. 7,295,443 to accused Sony product		GGGG
		TPL Claim Chart applying U.S. Patent No. 7,522,424 to accused Sony product		HHHH
		TPL Claim Chart applying U.S. Patent No. 7,295,443 to accused Sony product		IIII
		TPL Claim Chart applying U.S. Patent No. 7,522,424 to accused Sony product		JJJJ
		TPL Claim Chart applying U.S. Patent No. 7,295,443 to accused Sony product		KKKK
		TPL Claim Chart applying U.S. Patent No. 7,522,424 to accused Sony product		LLLL

Tr. Ex. No	Conf.	Description	Bates Range	Infringement Cont. Ex. No.
		TPL Claim Chart applying U.S. Patent No. 7,295,443 to accused Sony product		MMMM
		TPL Claim Chart applying U.S. Patent No. 7,522,424 to accused Sony product		NNNN
		TPL Claim Chart applying U.S. Patent No. 7,295,443 to accused Sony product		OOOO
		TPL Claim Chart applying U.S. Patent No. 7,522,424 to accused Sony product		PPPP
		TPL Claim Chart applying U.S. Patent No. 7,295,443 to accused Sony product		QQQQ
		TPL Claim Chart applying U.S. Patent No. 7,522,424 to accused Sony product		RRRR
		TPL Claim Chart applying U.S. Patent No. 7,295,443 to accused Sony product		SSSS

- Inv. 337-TA-841 Direct Witness Statement of Dale Buscaino: CX-944C (see at least the following specific Q&A listed in the table below).

<b>Canon</b>	‘443 - Q&A 547-579, Q&A 581-586 ‘424 - Q&A 587-618, Q&A 620-625
<b>HP</b>	‘443 - Q&A 970-1054, Q&A 1056-1062 ‘424 - Q&A 1063-1148, Q&A 1169-1175 ‘847 - Q&A 1176- 1193
<b>HiTi</b>	‘443 - Q&A 1252-1272 ‘424 - Q&A 1273-1310
<b>Kingston</b>	‘443 - Q&A 1314-1330, Q&A 1331-1336 ‘424 - Q&A 1337- 1367, Q&A 1368-1374
<b>Newegg/Rosewill</b>	‘443 - Q&A 1412- 1429 ‘424 - Q&A 1430-1448

Seiko	'443 - Q&A 1514-1541, Q&A 1543-1548 '424 - Q&A 1549-1579, Q&A 1580-1586
-------	--

- Inv. 807 Direct Witness Statement of Dale Buscaino: CX-0231C (see at least the following specific Q&A listed in the table below, which contains evidence confirming Sony's infringement).

Sony	'443 - Q&A 420-429, Q&A 430-537, Q&A 538-540, Q&A 541-543 '424 - Q&A 420-429, Q&A 544-553, Q&A 554-696, Q&A 697-702
------	--

## II. P.R. 3-2 Document Production Accompanying Disclosure

- (a) Documents (e.g., contracts, purchase orders, invoices, advertisements, marketing materials, offer letters, beta site testing agreements, and third party or joint development agreements) sufficient to evidence each discussion with, disclosure to, or other manner of providing to a third party, or sale of or offer to sell, or any public use of, the claimed invention prior to the date of application for the patent in suit. A party's production of a document as required herein shall not constitute an admission that such document evidences or is prior art under 35 U.S.C. § 102;

Plaintiffs are not aware of any documents in their possession responsive to P.R. 3-2(a).

- (b) All documents evidencing the conception, reduction to practice, design, and development of each claimed invention, which were created on or before the date of application for the patent in suit or the priority date identified pursuant to Patent L.R. 3-1(f), whichever is earlier;

Along with the information included in the file histories identified in subsection (c) below, Plaintiff also identifies: U.S. Patent No. 6,438,638, TPL1021052-TPL1021075; the file history of U.S. Patent No. 6,438,638, TPL1006295-TPL1006364; the OnSpec evaluation board dated the fifty-second week of 1998 (ITC Inv. 841 Trial Exhibit CPX0018); and TPL118736-122302, TPL122651- 213147 and TPL391727-391742 as responsive to P.R. 3-2(b).<sup>4</sup>

- (c) A copy of the file history for each patent in suit; and

<sup>4</sup> Citations to Bates numbers in this subsection are to documents produced in Investigation 841.

Copies of the file histories for each patent in suit bear the following production numbers:

- i. U.S. Patent No.7,295,443: TPL1002199-TPL1002675;
- ii. U.S. Patent No. 7,522,424: TPL1004133-TPL1004846; and
- iii. U.S. Patent No. 7,719,847: TPL1006725-TPL1010784.<sup>5</sup>

**(d) All documents evidencing ownership of the patent rights by the party asserting patent infringement.**

All documents evidencing ownership of the patent rights by Plaintiffs bear the following production numbers:

- i. U.S. Patent No.7,295,443 - TPL1042594-TPL1042652;
- ii. U.S. Patent No. 7,522,424 - TPL1042653-TPL1042711; and
- iii. U.S. Patent No. 7,719,847 - TPL1042771-TPL1042826.

**(e) If a party identifies instrumentalities pursuant to Patent L.R. 3-1(g), documents sufficient to show the operation of any aspects or elements of such instrumentalities the patent claimant relies upon as embodying any asserted claims.**

See subsection 3-1(g) above.

Dated: October 14, 2015

By: /s/ Michael P. Kella  
Anthony G. Simon (*pro hac vice*)  
Michael P. Kella (*pro hac vice*)  
Benjamin R. Askew (*pro hac vice*)  
Timothy D. Krieger (*pro hac vice* forthcoming)  
THE SIMON LAW FIRM, P.C.  
800 Market Street, Suite 1700  
St. Louis, Missouri 63101  
P. 314.241.2929  
F. 314.241.2029  
asimon@simonlawpc.com  
mkella@simonlawpc.com

---

<sup>5</sup> Citations to Bates numbers in this subsection are to documents produced in Investigation 841.



baskew@simonlawpc.com  
tkrieger@simonlawpc.com

and

Henry C. Bunsow  
Denise De Mory  
Brian A.E. Smith  
BUNSOW DE MORY SMITH & ALLISON LLP  
351 California Street, Suite 200  
San Francisco, CA 94104  
T. (415) 426-4747  
F. (415) 426-4744  
hbunsow@bdiplaw.com  
ddemory@bdiplaw.com  
bsmith@bdiplaw.com  
*Attorneys for Plaintiffs Technology Properties  
Limited LLC and MCM Portfolio LLC*